

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Formalities**

Claims 1-9 and 18-32 remain in the subject patent application. Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 27-29, and 32 are amended herein. No claims are canceled or added. Claims 10-17 were canceled and claims 18-24 were withdrawn in earlier papers. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 29 can be found at least in FIGs. 3 and 4. Claims 4, 6, 9, 27, 28, and 32 were amended in order to address minor discrepancies therein having to do with antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added herein.

### **II. Response to the 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 4, 7, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,281,042 to Ahn et al. (hereinafter “Ahn”). Claims 1 and 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,391,917 to Gilmour et al. (hereinafter “Gilmour”). These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the remarks made below.

Anticipation requires each element of a claimed invention to be disclosed in a single reference. Disclosure cannot be predicated on teachings in a reference that are vague or based upon conjecture. It is respectfully submitted that silence in a reference is not a proper substitute for an adequate disclosure of facts from which a conclusion of anticipation may justifiably follow. A proper anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that each element of a claimed invention be disclosed in a single reference having the same elements, united in the same way, and performing the same function.

#### **A. Remarks Directed to Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended herein such that it now requires a package connector at the second side of the package substrate and a board coupled to the package connector and further requires the memory device to be located in a cavity defined by the package connector, the package substrate, and the board. These limitations are described at least in FIGs. 3 and 4 of the originally-filed patent application.

It is respectfully submitted that the stated limitations are not shown or disclosed by either Ahn or Gilmour.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is allowable. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of amended claim 1, and allowance of the claim, is therefore respectfully requested.

**B. Remarks Directed to Claims 4-7 and 9**

Dependent claims must be construed to include all of the limitations of the claims from which they depend, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) and M.P.E.P. 608.01(n). Therefore, claims 4-7 and 9, which depend from amended claim 1, are also not shown or disclosed by Ahn or by Gilmour for at least the same reasons as listed earlier for amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-7 and 9 are allowable at least because of their dependence from an allowable claim. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections of claims 4-7 and 9, and allowance of the claims, is therefore respectfully requested.

**III. Response to the 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

Claims 2, 3, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ahn. Claims 8, 25, 26, and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gilmour. These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the remarks made below.

**A. Remarks Directed to Claims 1 and 29**

The above discussion set forth Applicant's contention that the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 1 was no longer supportable because the amendments made herein to that claim are not shown or disclosed by Ahn or by Gilmour. For reasons similar to those set forth above in that discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Ahn nor Gilmour teach or suggest the limitations of amended claim 1 such that the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections of those claims, it is respectfully submitted, are likewise no longer supportable.

Claim 29 has been amended herein such that it now requires limitations that are the same as or very similar to those discussed above for amended claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that both amended claim 1 and amended claim 29 would be allowable over Ahn and Gilmour.

Because claims 2, 3, 8, and 25-28 depend from amended claim 1 and claims 30-32 depend from amended claim 29, and because dependent claims must be construed to include all of the limitations of the claims from which they depend, as discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 3, 8, and 25-32 are allowable based at least in part on their dependence from an allowable claim. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections of claims 2, 3, 8, and 25-32, and allowance of the claims, is therefore respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Remarks Directed to the Prior Art Made of Record and Not Relied Upon**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is thought to neither show nor disclose, teach, or suggest at least one limitation of each of the pending claims.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this Response. However, the Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any fees due, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 50-0221.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of this application, Applicant invites Examiner Nguyen to call the undersigned attorney at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 20, 2010

/Kenneth A. Nelson/  
Kenneth A. Nelson  
Patent Attorney  
Intel Corporation  
Registration No. 48,677  
[kenneth.a.nelson@intel.com](mailto:kenneth.a.nelson@intel.com)  
(480) 715-0655